TRANSFERRED TO
HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL

The Protestant Review

(Formerly The Converted Catholic)

Volume XXXIII, Number 4

April, 1916

Nathan and the Pope.

THE ADDRESS OF SIGNOR NATHAN,

ex-Mayor of Rome, which has enraged the pope and has excited American Romanists to Boycott the Panama Exposition.

THE POPE'S UNPRECEDENTED REPLY.

SIGNOR NATHAN'S REJOINDER.

32 PAGES. PRICE TEN CENTS A COPY.

Why must We Fight the Roman Church?

By Bishop Manuel Ferrando, D.D.

Five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred.

"An admirable address."—The Guardian of Liberty.

The President and the "Pan-American" Political Thanksgiving Mass,

By the Rev. Prof. W. Russell Collins, D.D.

Five cents a copy, fifty cents a dozen, four dollars a hundred,

"A powerful pamphlet."—The Guardian of Liberty.

"Ought to be written in golden letters and posted on every door of the whole White House; . . . ought to be sent to every senator, congressman, preacher and editor in this land."—P. A. Seguin, ex-priest and author.

"The best thing I have seen in a long time, and I read most all of the patriotic papers."—V. L. W.

The Protestant Review

A MONTHLY MAGAZINE

Published by

CHRIST'S MISSION

EVANGELICAL—NON-SECTARIAN.

Founded by the late, the Rev. James A. O'Connor, 1883.

MANUEL FERRANDO, Director and Editor.

331 West 57th Street, NEW YORK.

VOL. XXXIII. APRIL, 1916. No. 4.

CONTENTS

	Page
Christ's Mission—To Our Faithful Friends	98
Editorial Notes—	99
" " Raid Bar Under Church	99
" " The Coldness of the Church	100
" " Lottery in a Roman Catholic Church	101
Our Heritage. By Catherine Walter	102
The Finances of the Vatican—Shortage of Peter's Pence. The Catholic Times	105
Letter to Cardinal Gibbons. XLVIII. By Bishop Manuel Ferrando	106
Contend Earnestly for the Faith. By Robert Haldane	112
Catholic Teaching Versus Constitution	115
Constitution or Pope? The Pope is a Sovereign. By Gilbert O. Nations	116
Is the Roman Church in Politics?	124
Changes in Bolivia, Once Under Rome's Sway	125
Relics in the Papal Cathedral	126
Another Infamous Bill. By G. O. Nations	127

SUBSCRIPTION RATES, POSTPAID.

All subscriptions are payable annually in advance.

Subscription per year	**$1.50**	**To Ministers and Missionaries**	**$1.00**
Single copy	15	Twenty or more copies, each	10
Ten copies to one address, per year, each	1.25	Agents, 20 or more copies per year, each	1.00

Subscription per year in English money, Six shillings threepence.

Remittances should be made by Check, P. O. Money Order, Express Order or Draft on New York, made payable to Christ's Mission or to The Protestant Review, 331 West Fifty-seventh Street, New York. Cash should be sent by Registered Mail. United States postage stamps received in small quantities and small denominations. Do not send stamps above ten cents each. Do not send Canadian or other foreign stamps or money.

Expiration. The date of the address label, on the wrapper, indicates the month and year of the expiration of the subscription. It is a bill when the subscription price is past due, and a receipt after payment is made and the date is changed.

Change of Address. In making changes, send both old and new address.

Correspondence. Address all correspondence to the Director of Christ's Mission, 331 West 57th Street, New York City.

Entered at the Post Office, New York, as second-class matter.

CHRIST'S MISSION

To Our Faithful Friends:

The time has come for an earnest appeal in behalf of our work. This does not mean that Christ's Mission is in the doldrums; on the contrary, the Mission was never more efficient, never more hopeful than now. But larger opportunity calls for larger effort. At this moment a number of applications are at hand which cannot be granted with the facilities in hand. We must undertake bolder and larger things; and to whom can we look for the wherewithal if not to our old and faithful friends?

FIRST, we ought to double our list of subscribers for THE PROTESTANT REVIEW. *Every new subscriber means another friend of Christ's Mission. May we look for one new name from you?*

SECOND, we want to enlarge our working force at the Mission, which has always been inadequate; but we cannot do this unless you say so.

THIRD, we want contributions that will enable us to furnish an immediate refuge and fostering care for such fugitives from superstition as are now vainly appealing to us. Our work is of such a character that to trumpet it from the housetops would merely invite the more bitter opposition of those who, for obvious reasons, are bitter against us. We must, therefore, through the semi-confidential medium of our magazine, appeal to old friends, like yourself who know that we are constrained by the love of Christ and devotion to truth and righteousness as revealed in the Word of God.

Will you not (without putting this appeal one side for the "more convenient season," which usually means never) sit down at once and mail your contribution to Mr. Henry M. Leith, Treasurer, 331 West 57th Street, New York City?

BISHOP ROBT. L. RUDOLPH, M.A., D.D., *President.*
REV. DAVID JAMES BURRELL, D.D., LL.D., *Secretary.*
MR. HENRY M. LEITH, *Treasurer.*
BISHOP MANUEL FERRANDO, D.D., *Director.*
REV. HENRY COLLIN MINTON, D.D.
REV. OSCAR M. VOORHEES, D.D.
MR. A. A. ROBBINS.
MR. MADISON J. H. FERRIS.

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY
APR 24 1916
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

The
Protestant Review

"Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, quit you like men, be strong."
(1 Cor. 16: 13.)

Vol. XXXIII APRIL, 1916 No. 4

EDITORIAL NOTES

"They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." —John 17: 16.

This text gives us the real reason why the Church of to-day is "internally rent and torn asunder and incapable of molding the national conscience."

Jesus expressly declared that His Kingdom was not of this world, and that His followers, although in the world, should not be of it; but the energy displayed by many who claim to be His followers looks as if they were in reality seeking worldly power and influence rather than the favor of God.

I have witnessed entertainments in the basement of Roman Catholic churches in this country, which were I to tell of in Spain, I would not be believed. The following paragraph, published in the "New York Times," reports conditions which are as nothing compared to what I myself saw:

RAID BAR UNDER A CHURCH.

DRINKS WERE SERVED IN A PATERSON WORKINGMEN'S CLUB.

(Special to The New York Times.)

PASSAIC, N. J., Jan. 23.—A fully equipped bar was discovered this afternoon in the basement of St. Stephen's Hungarian Catholic Church, Hird and Morris Streets, when Captain of Detectives Benjamin F. T. Turner, who has been investigating violations of the Sunday-selling law, broke into the rooms of the Hungarian Catholic Workingmen's Club.

Two men, who gave their names as Andrew Borozasky and Andrew Molanan, who were serving drinks behind a bar to twenty-seven young men in the room, were arrested. On the discovery that the club has been dispensing spirituous refreshments to

its members without a liquor license, a second charge was entered against the two prisoners, who will be arraigned in the City Court of Passaic to-morrow.

Of course, the Roman Church can count on the votes of the young men whose passions she encourages, but is she fulfilling her mission as a Christian Church?

The following article by the Rev. E. P. Marvin is a striking commentary on the failure of the Church to live up to the Master's standard, and a scathing rebuke to all churches that follow worldly methods for the support of their "work":

"THE COLDNESS OF THE CHURCH.

"In discharging our duty as a watchman, noting the signs of the times, it often becomes our painful duty to record, among other events, the sad evidences of degeneracy in the Church. Step by step the world has advanced within her portals, and with the blazoned effrontery of the devil has succeeded in so demoralizing those who should have withstood the tempter's power, as to bring disgrace upon all their pretensions to purity and holiness. The Church is no longer regarded as a bright and shining light —a living example for the imitation of others. There are too many 'social' gatherings for fun, negro minstrel shows, oyster suppers, fairs, grab-bag and other gambling operations, besides the out-and-out theatrical entertainments, all for the *benefit* of the Church or Sunday-school. *Benefit*, indeed! Would to God the money raised by such means had never been accepted in the Church's name! It has been the money of disease and death, and will prove to be worse than the plague to all who touch it.

"Think of it! The God of Heaven and earth, and His holy Son, Jesus, the objects of our deepest love and holy reverence, to be thus dishonored by being paraded, as it were, before the ungodly as beggars for their miserable pelf—and this, too, by the so-called children of God. And seeing that the world will not consent to part with their wealth unless some equivalent is received, these 'followers of Christ' consent to dance with them, eat with them, make fun for them in every way possible, so as to draw from their pockets money for Christ's Church on earth! Think of the apostles of our Lord or the early Christians doing such things! Supposing we read in the Acts of the Apostles

accounts of such doings in those early days, should we have any respect for them now? Would such a religion as this have lived eighteen hundred years, think you, and given such sweet repose and consolation to the dying? Far from it. It is of the devil and will receive no recognition now or hereafter from God. It is this that has chilled the Church to death. The thermometer of zeal in the Lord's work has gone down, down, below zero, until the church members are so stupefied with cold as to be nearly paralyzed.

"When the Church lends itself to the devil, what can we expect of the world at large? The day was when such things were not, and could not be, for the members of the Church were too much alive to its best interests to consent for a moment to such compromises with the devil and his agents. Were it not for the minority in the Church to-day who have piled the fuel of *faith*—a living faith—upon their hearts, warming them up to zealous activity, we should see and hear nothing of real Christianity anywhere. But we regard the present coldness as one of the evidences of the coming change, the dawning of the better day, the millennium. First, however, judgments—sweeping judgments—must come, which shall destroy the refuge of lies now so prevalent over the earth. Oh, hail, happy day! Come quickly!"

"LOTTERY IN A ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH"

In a recent issue of "L'Opinione," an Italian newspaper published in Philadelphia, appeared a notice which, translated reads as follows:

Mt. Carmel, Pa.

For the Italian Church.—Three great lotteries are arranged for the evening of the 26th (Sunday) of the current month, and on the evenings of the first and second Sunday of January next in the basement of the Church of St. Peter, capably ruled by the Rev. V. Chizzola. The said lotteries will be entirely for the benefit of the Church, on account of which every good citizen devoted to Catholicism has the very sacred duty of helping on the above-mentioned evenings. For my part I predict a great success.

Is a lottery any more legal or respectable for being held in a church, and for the benefit of the church? By the jugglery of Rome law-breakers are transformed into pious performers of a *"sacred duty,"* and, so far as we know, they were not interfered with by the authorities on this occasion.

OUR HERITAGE

Is it not time that we should come to realize that a very large proportion of God's children—"heirs of God, joint-heirs with Christ," as St. Paul says in his epistle to the Romans, have been kept out of their heritage for over a thousand years? As is, unfortunately, usually the case, this has been done by the trustees of that heritage; but in this case the trustees were self-appointed, and consequently are doubly responsible and doubly guilty.

This seems like a severe arraignment, does it not? But is it any too severe for the case under consideration? Let us see.

In ordinary, every-day law, which regulates conditions between man and man, any one who misappropriates funds or property which he holds in trust for another, or others, or does not give a full accounting of that property, or that money, is held amenable to law and is branded with the ugly terms "embezzler," etc. But this refers only to temporary and transitory and perishable property, which a flood or fire might destroy, and which might be rehabilitated under those conditions, provided the rightful owner could prove his title.

But what shall we say of the trustees of the Word of God—which is the only title-deed by which we can prove our spiritual heritage, and by which alone we know that we are all the children and heirs of that heritage—when we come to the knowledge that we have been kept out of that inheritance and treated as foundlings? Foundlings? Say, rather, criminals, destined to some place of torment (purgatory), which our trustees have thoughtfully provided for us, probably that we may not have a chance to "get back at them." And in order to keep us guessing and hoping, they hold a figurative bunch of carrots before our eyes in the form of masses, indulgences, etc., not that they have the slightest idea of ever allowing us to get out, but in order to make us believe that they are trying hard to alleviate our sufferings in the place of torment to which they have carefully consigned us, while they thrive and prosper at our expense.

If all the money that has been paid for masses for the so-called dead—many of whom were much more saintly than those who say the masses for their souls—were collected together, I

believe all the banks of the world could not contain it. And, besides this, there is the money for indulgences, special dispensations by the pope to wealthy and favored clients—the former implies the latter. And what has become of all this money? The Roman Catholic poor fill our cities, our asylums and institutions, and yet, like the proverbial horse-leech, the cry of the Holy Roman Church is, "Give, give!"

There is of course, a practical side, even in things religious, and in all honest business transactions you are supposed to get an equivalent for your money, either in the way of goods or security. What security does the Roman Catholic Church give that the souls in purgatory are any better off after their relatives—many of whom can ill afford it—have paid their good money into the Church's coffers? It gives absolutely no security, and the mass is simply, as it were, a receipt for the money, for which it does not deliver the goods, trusting to the ignorance or credulity of its customer, who is a "child of the Church," mark you, not a "child of God."

If this "child of the Church" were awake to the fact that he or she is a "child of God," according to the terms of the treaty set forth in our "heritage," the Bible, would he not trust God, his Father, rather than any self-appointed or man-ordained trustee, or middleman, who seeks to keep him from the knowledge and enjoyment of his heritage—the pure word of God—substituting therefor the counsels and interpretation of men—poor, weak, fallible men, no matter how many vestments they may wear, and who, most of them, have themselves been kept out of their heritage, lest, "seeing, they should see, and hearing, they should hear," and should learn that all their works avail nothing in the sight of Him who knoweth the secrets of all hearts and who alone is able to "save to the uttermost all who call upon Him," without the need of any masses, or indulgences, or devices of men?

Now, as in every-day life, those who have been defrauded seek to regain their heritage, why should not God's children, who have been defrauded of what is of far more value than money or land, for it teacheth the way of life, regain their heritage, the Bible? This is the only book of any authority to a Christian, and yet it is the one book that has been banished from our schools

and colleges through partisan political influence, wielded by the nominal believers in the teachings of the Founder of our religion, the Romish Church, or "sect." For the only true "Church," or "Congregation," as the word was used originally, is the "fellowship of Christ's faithful followers"—no pope, no priests, no purgatory, but simply the Bible for their guide and rule of conduct. Without the Bible we are indeed "foundlings," for whom the Roman Catholic Church is an asylum; with the Bible we learn that we may all become inheritors with the saints, and heirs of the promises of the Old Testament—the Bible of our religious ancestors, the Jews—as well as of the Kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, through the promises of the New Testament. And this word, "saints," does not mean those who, for political or other reasons, have been canonized by a mandate of the Holy See, but it means "God's people," those who are guided by the Holy Spirit and act in conformity therewith.

Luther was the first who was brave enough, or, rather, strong enough, to come out boldly and claim his heritage, and this as much because he had a good, level head and could no longer be bamboozled by the hypocritical pretensions of an avaricious and corrupt hierarchy, seeking to become powerful and wealthy at the expense of those whom it kept in subjection through ignorance and fear, as from spiritual motives. He saw, as all monks must, the entire lack of spirituality in the conditions by which he was surrounded, and was manly and honest enough to cast aside fear, and, taking his stand on God's word alone, to come out boldly and defy the greatest monopoly the world has ever known—the Romish Church. He was not only a patriot like the no less admirable John Huss; he was a rebel against intrenched privilege, and against "the workers of wickedness in high places." We little realize to-day what strength of will, what determination, what absolute fearlessness was needed to take the step that Luther took, and if we were not moral cowards and time-servers we should take the same attitude to-day, for the same danger confronts us as confronted Luther—the danger of religio-political tyranny, with all that it implies in the way of growth of political corruption and loss of moral fibre.

We need another Luther!

CATHERINE WALTER.

THE FINANCES OF THE VATICAN—SHORTAGE OF PETER'S PENCE

As might be expected in the case of a great centre which depends for its revenues upon every part of the civilized world, the Holy See has been a heavy sufferer financially from the war of the nations. The receipts of Peter's Pence are considerably lower, especially in the countries most seriously affected by the European conflict.

Of the Holy See's four sources of revenue, viz., Peter's Pence, dividends from invested funds, private offerings to the pope from wealthy (R) Catholics visiting Rome and receipts from entrance fees to the Vatican museums and galleries, it would be difficult to say which has been the greater sufferer. It is scarcely necessary to point out the depreciation in stocks; private offerings are reduced to almost nil, as foreigners no longer visit Rome on account of the international crisis; and the amount of the entrance fees to the Vatican museums—the most of which went to pay the small army of attendants, custodians, etc., employed in the buildings—is likewise less.

The Sovereign Pontiff has to support the members of the Sacred College, dignitaries of the Vatican, lawyers, military men and gendarmes, artists and artisans, domestics, laborers, and servants of various descriptions. In addition, he has to support the papal nuncios and delegates, with their houses and staffs in different countries of the two worlds according to the state due to the representatives of the Holy See. Along with this the pope must bear the cost of the wear and tear of the largest palace in existence, and find funds for his generous public and private charities.

With a view to meeting the requirements of the crisis, his holiness has had to retrench expenses considerably. Chaplaincies have had to be suspended where feasible, and other sources of outlay have had to be closed up. How long this condition of things may last will, of course, depend upon the length of the war.—The (R) Catholic Times, March 5th.

And yet the pope allows the war to continue! Why?

LETTER TO CARDINAL GIBBONS

XLVIII.

My dear Cardinal:

Since our last issue the situation in Mexico has become very grave. In my own opinion the task the United States Government has set itself is not going to be such an easy one as was at first thought, and I consider your Church to be responsible to a great extent for the actual state of affairs there and for the complications which will undoubtedly arise.

We have in Mexico a good example to illustrate the subject of my last letter, and to clinch my argument that in spite of what you may say to the contrary, your Church is a political machine, and that she disregards the spiritual welfare of the people in order to advance her claims to political dominion. Nothing, in my opinion, will better serve to open the eyes of Americans than this interference in Mexican affairs and the incidents connected with it. Your Church is becoming too bold not to find out very soon how mistaken is the policy she has been pursuing. I hope every one of our soldiers will come back with a story to refute your bold affirmation to the effect that "all that has been done in Mexico in the past for civilization, for progress, for humanity, has been done under the guidance of the Church." This astounding assertion is contained in a lengthy report of an interview with you published in the "New York American," and copied by "America," the organ of the Jesuits.

I cannot understand how you dare to make such a statement. It is said that when God sees fit to chastise a people He blinds them. Are you blind, and is this the cause of your blindness, or have you such a poor opinion of the enlightenment of this generation that you think every one is ready to swallow without question whatever you offer them? Can you tell me of one single case where your Church has served as a guide to progress and civilization anywhere, least of all in Mexico?

I am not going to touch upon the political history of your Church in Mexico—that would require an extensive work of several volumes. But to understand the plan of action of the Church in that country, we need only quote the letter which Pius IX. addressed to the poor, deluded Emperor, Maximilian. "Your

Majesty," says the pope, "is well aware that, in order effectually to repair the evils occasioned by the revolution, and to bring back as soon as possible happy days *for the Church,* the Catholic religion must, *above all things,* continue to be the glory and the mainstay of the Mexican nation, *to the exclusion of every other dissenting worship;* that the bishops must be perfectly free in the exercise of their pastoral ministry; and that religious orders should be re-established, or organized, conformably with the instructions and the powers *which we have given;* that the patrimony of the Church and the rights which attach to it may be maintained and protected; that *no person may obtain the faculty of teaching and publishing false and subversive tenets;* that instruction, *whether public or private, should be directed and watched over by the ecclesiastical authority;* and that, in short, the chains may be broken which, up to the present time, have held down the Church in a state of dependence and subject to the arbitrary rule of civil government."

This attitude of the papacy with regard to Mexico is also its attitude with regard to the United States and every other country. In this whole program of the Church we can discern not a single thought for the betterment of the people. The pope is anxious only to bring back as soon as possible "happy days for the Church," and for this purpose he does not hesitate to say the Church should be placed above everything else. He demands that every dissenting form of worship be excluded, and that the clergy not only be immune, but that they be free to act according to instructions and power given them by the pope. If such demands are not in absolute conflict with good citizenship, I do not know how to qualify them. That "no person may obtain the faculty of teaching and publishing false and subversive tenets (that is to say, anything different from the teachings of Rome), that "public and private instruction should be directed and watched over by the ecclesiastical authority"—all this may not mean the union of Church and State, but it certainly does mean making the State the dupe of the Church. And all this while, according to your own historian, Alzog, the bishops in Mexico were receiving from the State salaries as high as $130,000, and

none less than $25,000, annually. So dearly did the State have to pay for the privilege of being the slave of the Church!

In the city of Mexico alone the Church held over $2,000,000 worth of property. It is said that, at the banquet which Maximilian gave to the diplomats, the archbishop proposed a toast to "the foremost man of the new world," and Maximilian responded with the following compliment: "Your Eminence, all my glory is still on paper, in the form of credentials from the greatest power of the old world. Yet, though I may be the paymaster of the treasury, the greatest man in the new world is yourself, whose empire extends over the souls and bodies, as well as the dominions and possessions of this empire, the emperor included."

Now, what, Cardinal, did the Church, possessing such absolute power and freedom of action do for the advancement of civilization in Mexico, or for the spiritual welfare of her people? I fail to see any single instance in which the Church has not been a hindrance to national progress and the chief cause of the revolutions which have repeatedly filled that unfortunate land with bloodshed and turmoil.

The best historians of your Church declare boastingly that no government hostile to her could succeed in retaining its power in Mexico, and to prove their assertion they refer to the cases of Arista, Santa Ana and Zuloaga; and I have not the slightest doubt that the present disturbance has been instigated by the Church.

A candid survey of the history of the Church in Mexico will be sufficient to convince the unprejudiced mind that her chief object was not the good of the people. No country that has over 150 monasteries of monks and over 57 convents of nuns can expect to perceive a ray of the light of progress. In no place could the celebrated saying of Victor Hugo be more appropriately applied than in Mexico: "Every town has a light—the teacher, and one who puts out that light—the priest."

The population of Mexico may be divided into four principal groups—Spaniards, Creoles, Mestizos and Indians. As was natural, the Spaniards favored their own countrymen the monks, and hated the natives for their separation from the mother coun-

try. Of course, they were not there for pleasure, but for business purposes. To what lengths they went to secure their own advantage and the advantage of the monks, their "partners," has never been properly related. It is to the Church's interest not to have it related. But that these two elements, the monks and Spaniards, have repelled every effort to enlighten the Creoles, Mestizos and Indians is undeniable.

Besides, the Church in Mexico could never accomplish any good, because of the evil elements of which she herself was composed. Let me remind you once more, Cardinal, that whatever I write is a report of my own personal experience or what I have learned from the authorities of the Church themselves. Cardinal Vives told me he did not believe that in Mexico there was a single bishop guiltless of simony. In exactly what way simony was practised I do not know. He may have referred to the fact that candidates for bishoprics have won over politicians to advocate their election by bribery; but I also know that Rome would not confirm their election without large sums of money going to the Vatican.

The corruption in Mexican convents and monasteries, according to all reports from my former colleagues must have been simply unspeakable. I heard from some fathers who had been living in Mexico things which could scarcely be believed but they could not all have been lies, for in 1892 the superior of a Franciscan convent in Spain told me that every one of the members of his order who came back from Mexico either left the order or had to be expelled, so that to protect the Franciscan order in Spain, they had to appeal to the pope to forbid the return of any monk who was sent to Mexico. Discipline and morality, according to this superior, were entirely unknown in Mexican convents. And the foreign secular clergy was chiefly composed of priests from France or Spain who could not be retained in any diocese in their own country on account of their misdemeanors of one sort or another. It was the common practise, when any priest was the cause of public scandal, for his bishop to have him transferred to Mexico. I know of a special case in point, in which I acted as synodical judge. A Carmelite convent in Spain became involved in a great scandal, and upon

investigation a nephew of the bishop, who was then a student in the seminary, was found to be the guilty party. He was sent to Cuba, and later a friend and fellow-seminarist of his informed me that he had been ordained and transferred to Mexico, where he became the canon of a cathedral. But what was most surprising was that, after a few months, the nun whose name had appeared in the scandal followed him there as his sister.

I know also of several cases of monks being expelled in Spain and then going to Mexico, where they made their fortunes and acquired positions of influence by means of political intrigue.

It is evident that such elements comprising the greater part of the clergy, and by far the most influential part, could bring no good of any kind to the people who were obliged to submit to their tyranny.

According to your statement, Cardinal, it would appear that the opposition of Mexicans to your Church is because they do not want civilization and enlightenment, which is not true. Their plea has always been that they were struggling against despotism and obscurantism. The following clipping from "The New York Times" gives a good idea of popular sentiment, at least of the sentiment of the best elements in Mexican society:

COLIMA, Mexico, Feb. 19.—Commemorating the anniversary of the arrest of President Madero by General Huerta, General Carranza yesterday opened a public library and night school for the workingmen of Colima in the church of Santa Maria.

In the course of the exercises Luis Cabrera, Minister of the Interior, defined the attitude of the Government toward the Catholic Church.

"This," he said, "is not a profanation; it is a simple act of justice. There are many more churches here than is needed. There are not enough schools, and to avoid the loss of time needed in building we simply take this structure and turn it into a school so that there will be no need for the meetings in the saloons. We do not condemn a church because it is a church, but when we find that there are many churches and no schools we take a church or two to use as schools. We are against the abuses committed by the churches and by the priests. We will have religious liberty, and all Mexicans shall worship as they desire. The priests must not participate in politics."

The general protest of the Catholics in this country against Carranza, which, I do not doubt, has had much to do with bring-

ing about the present crisis, is nothing but a political intrigue on the part of your Church, which has made her fall into such ridicule that when the excitement has abated it must work against her own interests. The great outcry for "religious liberty" in Mexico on the part of the Catholics has produced a laugh even among the nations most devoted to the Roman Church abroad, as we see in the European press. Every one knows you are not claiming "liberty of worship"—you are claiming the liberty described in the letter of Pius IX., which we have already quoted. This means liberty, or rather *license,* to do exactly what you please, and do away with anything or any one that may oppose you, even though to accomplish this it be necessary to instigate a revolution and shed rivers of innocent blood.

The syllabus prohibiting, under pain of excommunication, liberty of worship is still in force. If the Church is truly in favor of such liberty, why does she not proclaim it in all countries, instead of opposing every progressive measure contemplated by any government? There is only one answer—her aim is to dominate, and anything which might in any respect tend to diminish her power and prestige must be bitterly opposed.

I do not know of a single case of a bishop of your Church raising his voice in a plea to any government to take measures against the spread of atheism; nevertheless Spain and South America must submit to the influence of the Church with regard to restricting such laws as might give freedom of speech and of the press. As far as your Church is concerned, Cardinal, a man may be as much of a free-thinker as he likes, but he cannot be a *free-speaker.* You know that the ranks of your clergy, as well as of the Knights of Columbus, are filled with free-thinkers—but they dare not be free-speakers.

In our next issue we hope to follow up this subject more fully.

MANUEL FERRANDO.

"The judicial functionaries must refuse obedience to the State and to the laws of the country which are in contradiction with Roman Catholic precepts."

"It is an impious deed . . . to transgress the laws of the Church under the pretext of observing the civil law."—Leo XIII.

CONTEND EARNESTLY FOR THE FAITH

BY ROBERT HALDANE.

Everything reminds us of the shortness of life and the approach of eternity; and in the prospect of that hour when an account is to be rendered to God, it becomes most evident that the Holy Volume of inspiration, and the truths which it contains, are far too solemn and too sacred to be used as materials for the display of scholarship and the exercise of metaphysical ingenuity. I bless God for the opportunity He has given me of testifying for His truth in the face of the laborious efforts of these writers to obscure it with error.

Many religious persons have a dread of controversy, and wish truth to be stated without any reference to those who hold the opposite errors. Controversy and a bad spirit are, in their estimation, synonymous terms; and strenuously to oppose what is wrong is considered as contrary to Christian meekness. Those who hold this opinion seem to overlook what every page of the New Testament lays before us. In all the history of our Lord Jesus Christ we never find Him out of controversy. From the moment He entered on the discharge of His office in the synagogue of Nazareth till He expired on the cross, it was an uninterrupted scene of controversy. Nor did He with all the heavenly meekness, which in Him shone so brightly, treat truth and error without a reference to those who held them, or study to avoid giving its proper appellation to those corruptions in doctrine or practise that endangered the interests of immortal souls. His censures were not confined to doctrine, but included the abettors of false principles themselves.

And as to the apostles, their epistles are generally controversial. Most of them were directly written for the express purpose of vindicating truth and opposing error, and the authors of heresies do not escape with an abstract condemnation of their false doctrine. Paul again and again most indignantly denounces the conduct of the opposers of the Gospel, and by name points out those against whom he cautions his brethren. When Hymenæus and Alexander erred concerning the faith, and when he delivered them unto Satan, that they might learn not to blaspheme, he did not compliment them as amiable and learned persons. Even that

apostle who treats most of love, and who possessed so much of that spirit which was so eminently manifested in his Divine Master, does not avoid controversy; nor in controversy does he study to avoid severity of censure on the opposers of the truth.

In the examples of opposing error, left on record for our imitation, we perceive nothing of that frigid spirit of indifference which smiles on the corruptors of the Word of God and shuns to call heresy by its proper name. With what holy indignation do the apostles denounce the subtle machinations of the enemies of the Gospel! In vain shall we look among those faithful servants of the Lord for anything to justify that trembling reserve which fears to say decidedly that truth is truth and error is error. In what style, indeed, should perversions of the truth of God be censured? Ought they to be treated as mere matters of opinion on which we may innocently and safely differ? Or ought they to be met in a tone of solemn, strong and decided disapprobation? Paul warned Christians against men who arose from among themselves, speaking perverse things to draw away disciples after them, and instead of complimenting false teachers in his day, denounced an angel from Heaven on the supposition of his preaching another Gospel. And if an apostle was withstood to the face, because he was to be blamed, are the writings of those who subvert the Gospel to pass without rebuke? . . .

When the canker of the principles of neology, derived from the Continent and from America, is perverting the faith of many and seducing them into the paths of error; while a spirit of lukewarmness and indifference to truth is advancing under the mask of charity and liberality, there is a loud call on all Christians to "Stand fast in one spirit, with one mind striving together for the faith of the Gospel," to present a firm and united phalanx of opposition to error under every name, from whatever quarter it may approach. . . . Should believers become unfaithful to their trust and be seduced to abandon their protest against false doctrines, they may gain the approbation of the world; but what will this avail, when compared with the favor of God? But, if, with prayer to God, in the use of the appointed means, they contend earnestly for the truth, then they may expect the gracious fulfilment of that blessed promise, "When the enemy shall come

in like a flood, the Spirit of the Lord shall lift up a standard against him."

The following three items were written by the late Charles Haddon Spurgeon:

"We live in perilous times; we are passing through a most eventful period; the Christian world is convulsed; there is a mighty upheaval of the old foundations of faith, a great overhauling of old teaching. The Bible is made to speak to-day in a language which to our fathers would be an unknown tongue. Gospel teachings, the proclamation of which made men fear to sin and dread the thought of eternity, are being shelved. Calvary is being robbed of its glory, sin of its horror, and we are said to be evolving into a reign of vigorous and blessed sentimentality, in which Heaven and earth, God and man are to become a heap of sensational emotions."

* * * *

"A chasm is opening between the men who believe their Bibles and the men who are prepared for an advance upon Scripture. Inspiration and speculation cannot long abide in peace. Compromise there can be none. We cannot hold the inspiration of the Word, and yet reject it; we cannot believe in the atonement and deny it; we cannot hold the doctrine of the fall and yet talk of the evolution of spiritual life from human nature; we cannot recognize the punishment of the impenitent and yet indulge the 'larger hope.' One way or the other we must go. Decision is the virtue of the hour.

"Neither, when we have chosen our way, can we keep company with those who go the other way. There must come with decision for truth a corresponding protest against error. Let those who will keep the narrow way keep it, and suffer for their choice; but to hope to follow the broad road at the same time is an absurdity. What communion hath Christ with Belial?"

* * * *

"Suppose a man should speak the truth in the name of the Lord, and no one should believe him; suppose that good as well as bad should judge him to be perverse and pragmatical; suppose he should be forsaken by those who were once his adherents

and friends; suppose he should even die with the ill repute of being one who needlessly and in vain troubled Israel—what then? If in that which he had spoken he had been true to his conscience and to his God, what would he have lost by receiving no recognition from man? Lost! He would have been immeasurably the gainer, inasmuch as he would not have received his reward, but his crown would be laid up in Heaven 'against that day.' At any rate, he would have glorified his Lord by having been able to say, 'Although ministers should not proclaim the Gospel, nor professors confess the faith, the constancy of the faithful shall fail, and even the most godly abide in cowardly silence, courage shall fail from the brave and decision from the instructed, yet will I rejoice in the Lord and His eternal truth; yea, I will joy in the God of my salvation.'"

CATHOLIC TEACHING VERSUS CONSTITUTION.

CONSTITUTION.

Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

CATHOLIC TEACHING.

The State has not the right to leave every man free to profess and embrace whatever religion he shall deem true.

The Church has the right to require the State not to leave every man free to profess his own religion.—*Syllabus issued by Pius IX.*—1876. Consult "The Pope, the Kings and the People," by William Mullen & Sons, London and Belfast (Vol. I., p. 163).

That Church and State should be separate is a most false and pernicious doctrine.—*Pius X., in Vehementer Nos.*

What, then, is the principal obligation of heads of State?

Their principal obligation is to practise the Catholic religion themselves, and, as they are in power, to protect and defend it.—*Manual of Christian Doctrine* (p. 132). Text-book taught in Catholic schools in the United States.

CONSTITUTION.

Or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press.

CATHOLIC TEACHING.

The Church has the power of requiring the State not to permit free expression of opinion.—*Pius IX., in Syllabus of* 1876.

.We control the press of the United States.—*D. S. Phelan, in Sermon at Mt. Carmel Church, St. Louis, Jan.* 25, 1914, *and published in Western Watchman.*

CONSTITUTION OR POPE?

BY GILBERT O. NATIONS.

III.

THE POPE IS A SOVEREIGN.

1. *Distinction Between Religion and Politics.*—It will now be shown that the pope is a prince and sovereign. But at its very threshold this investigation will be confronted with the religious liberty established by the Constitution of the United States. The third clause of Article VI, of the Constitution provides that no religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office; and the first amendment to that document forbids Congress to make any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

Whatever difficulty may arise in meeting the foregoing charge springs from the dual capacity in which the pope, with the entire papal system, stands before the world. Every inquiry into the *civil* status and activities of the papacy is met by the complaint that the pope is a *religious* functionary and that the inquiry is interfering with the Catholic *religion*. Under the pretext of *worshiping God,* the pope and his adherents are primarily occupied with *politics*. No subterfuge has served the papal machine better than this clever vacillation between politics and religion. Any exposure of their *political* intrigues and villainy wrings from the Romanists a wail about *freedom of conscience.*

For instance, House of the Good Shepherd is a name which they use everywhere to give the appearance of Christlike benevolence to their prisons wherein young girls are incarcerated without trial, under conditions of servitude and degradation that drive many of the girls to sacrifice their lives in the effort to escape. Every demand that these institutions of mystery and horror be opened to public inspection is branded by Roman Catholic pulpit and press as unwarranted meddling with the Catholic *religion.*

When attention is called to the fact that Catholics have contrived to secure and hold three-fourths of the lucrative offices in our large cities, including the teachers in the public schools, objection is made that we are seeking to curb the *religious freedom* of the Catholic Church. The papal outfit must not be invited to

remove its front feet from the public trough for fear of wounding its *conscience.*

When the papacy maintains a cabinet of state, sends and receives ambassadors, makes treaties, controls public elections, packs committees of political parties, muzzles the press and assassinates public speakers, its activities are purely *political*—or *criminal*—certainly not *religious.* Let the distinction between religion and politics be kept clearly in view while the *civil* status of the pope as a *sovereign potentate* is being considered in the following pages.

2. *The Pope Supreme Overlord and Sovereign of Papal States.*—During the Middle Ages, when the feudal system obtained so extensively in Europe, the pope claimed supreme power as suzerain over all emperors, kings and sovereignties throughout the world; and many proud monarchs acknowledged this arrogant claim by bowing in humble submission to the popes as their overlords. The papacy then claimed and exercised the civil power to crown and uncrown all civil potentates at will.

The Middle Ages produced no more powerful and renowned monarchs than Pepin and Charlemagne, both of whom received their crowns from papal hands in return for political and military favors rendered to the popes. Pepin expressed his obligation to the pope for the crown of the Franks by driving the Lombards from northern Italy and giving their dominions in that peninsula to the popes, who as sovereign monarchs ruled the territory thus acquired more than a thousand years. For similar services rendered toward the end of the eighth century, Pope Leo III. crowned Charlemagne on the last Christmas of that century as Emperor of the Romans and successor of Cæsar and Constantine. Aside from his claim to civil superiority to all other potentates, there can be no question that the pope, as ruler of the papal States, was as truly a sovereign as any crowned head in Europe. All secular historians so declare.

3. *The Pope Loses Papal States, but Still Sovereign.*—On September 20, 1870, the pope was shorn of his territorial dominions by the Italian soldiery of King Victor Emmanuel, but he still claims to be the rightful ruler of the papal States and continues to exercise all the essential prerogatives of a privileged and preeminent sovereign. Prof. P. V. N. Myers, whose historical wri-

tings are so extensively used as text-books in the high schools and colleges of this country, gives, at pages 630 and 631 of his "Mediæval and Modern History," the following statement of the facts attending the territorial dispossession of the pope:

"The occupation of Rome by the Italian Government marked the end of the temporal power of the pope, and the end of an ecclesiastical state, the last in Europe, which from long before Charlemagne had held a place among the temporal powers of Europe, and during all that period had been a potent factor in the political affairs not only of Italy, but of almost the whole Continent. The papal troops, with the exception of a few guardsmen, were disbanded. The Vatican palace and some other buildings, with their grounds, were reserved to the pope as a place of residence, together with a yearly allowance of over $6,000,000. By a statute known as the Law of Papal Guarantees (1871), the pope was secured in the exercise of his spiritual functions.

"These arrangements have subsisted down to the present time. Under them the pope is not to be regarded as a subject of the Italian Government, but rather as A SOVEREIGN RESIDING AT ROME. Like a sovereign, he has the right to send and receive embassies. His person is inviolable. No Italian officer may enter the Vatican or its grounds, which the Italian Governments respects as though they were foreign territory. The popes have steadily refused to recognize the legitimacy of the act whereby they were deprived of the temporal government of Rome and the papal States, and have protested against it by refraining from setting foot outside the gardens of the Vatican, and by refusing to accept the annuity provided for them, and in various other ways.

"The partisans of the papacy maintain that the act of dispossession was an act of impious spoliation, and that THERE CAN BE NO SETTLEMENT OF THE ROMAN QUESTION SAVE THROUGH THE RESTORATION OF THE POPE TO HIS FORMER STATUS AS AN INDEPENDENT TEMPORAL SOVEREIGN."

In this connection, the author inserts the following marginal note on page 630 of the work just quoted:

"It is a matter worthy of note that just a few months before the loss of his temporal sovereignty a great ecumenical council

of the Catholic Church (the Vatican Council of 1869-70) had by a solemn vote proclaimed the doctrine of papal infallibility, which declares the decisions of the pope, when speaking *ex cathedra*, 'on questions of faith and morals,' to be infallible."

Prof. James Harvey Robinson, of Columbia University, in his "History of Western Europe," at page 667, relates the same facts in the following words:

"In August, 1870, the reverses of war compelled Napoleon to recall the French garrison from Rome, and the pope made little effort to defend his capital against the Italian army, which occupied it in September. The people of Rome voted by an overwhelming majority to join the kingdom of Italy; and the work of Victor Emmanuel and Cavour was consummated by transferring the capital to the Eternal City.

"Although the papal possessions were declared a part of the kingdom of Italy, a law was passed which guaranteed to the POPE THE RANK AND PRIVILEGES OF A SOVEREIGN PRINCE. He was to have his own ambassadors and court like the other European powers. No officer of the Italian Government was to enter the Latran or Vatican palaces upon any official mission. . . . The pope, however, refused to recognize the arrangement. He still regards himself as a prisoner, and the Italian Government as a usurper who has robbed him of his possessions. He has never accepted the income assigned to him, and still maintains that the independence which he formerly enjoyed as ruler of the papal States is essential to the best interests of the head of a great international Church."

All standard historical authorities that have touched on this subject, as well as the original records and statutes, might be cited to the same effect. The unanimous testimony of history establishes the following facts:

a. Prior to September 20, 1870, the pope was the unchallenged monarch of the papal States, including the city of Rome.

b. On that date he was dispossessed of these territorial dominions by the military forces of the King of Italy.

c. He is not regarded in Italy or elsewhere as a citizen or subject of the Italian Government, but as a *sovereign prince* residing at Rome.

d. He and his partisans and subjects regard his territorial

dispossession as lawless, and *declare that the sovereignty of Rome and the papal States is rightfully his and must be restored to him.*

4. *The Pope Recognized as "PRIVILEGED" Sovereign, Says Assistant Secretary of State.*—John Bassett Moore, professor of international law in Columbia University, was for many years Assistant Secretary of State of the United States, being retained in that position because of his eminent skill and attainments in the law of nations. Pursuant to an act of Congress, he compiled in 1906 an International Law Digest, which was published in eight large volumes by the Government of the United States. As a monument of learning and research this great work has no rival in the field of which it treats. On page 16 of Volume I, this work cites with approval the French treatise on the law of nations, published in Paris in 1896 by Alphonse Rivier as authority for the following statement that the pope is a privileged sovereign:

"The Holy See occupies a position analogous to that of States, and THE POPE IS TREATED AS A SOVEREIGN, AND EVEN AS A PRIVILEGED SOVEREIGN."

The sovereignty of the pope is further demonstrated by the fact that virtually all the governments of the world, including our own, receive and recognize his ambassadors and other diplomatic representatives, and most of the governments maintain diplomatic agents at the Vatican. On June 4, 1875, Hamilton Fish, as Secretary of State, answering certain inquiries submitted to him by Caleb Cushing, American Minister to Spain, used the following official language:

"While the probabilities seem to be almost entirely against the possibility of the restoration of any temporal power to the pope, HE IS STILL RECOGNIZED AS A SOVEREIGN by many of the powers of the world, which receive from him diplomatic representatives in the person of either a nuncio or a legate, or possibly in some other capacity, and which powers also accredit to him certain diplomatic representatives."—Moore's International Law Digest, vol. I, p. 39.

At the time when our Secretary of State thus declared in an official utterance that many powers recognize the pope as a sovereign, the United States was not one of those powers. We did not then maintain a diplomatic representative at the Vatican,

nor did we receive such a representative from the Holy See. But in 1893 the President of the United States received and recognized Monsignor Satolli as papal legate to our Government, since which time the pope has continued to maintain a diplomatic delegation at Washington. By so receiving his envoy of highest rank, the American Government has joined the other powers in recognizing the pope as a sovereign entitled as such to a place in the political councils of the world.

5. *The Pope's Diplomats Outrank all Others.*—Not only do the powers receive diplomatic representatives of the pope and thus accord to him a place in the family of sovereign States, but his legates and nuncios outrank the highest diplomatic agents of all other nations. On March 21, 1848, Senator Cass said in the course of a debate in the United States Senate:

"In Europe, by universal consent, the POPE'S LEGATE TAKES PRECEDENCE OF ANY MEMBER OF THE SAME GRADE IN THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS."—Moore's International Law Digest, vol. IV, p. 735.

On February 20, 1897, Richard Olney, as Secretary of State, declared officially that

"THE PRECEDENCE OF THE PAPAL REPRESENTATIVE AS DEAN OF THE DIPLOMATIC CORPS is a personal courtesy paid to his sacred calling, and is incapable of delegation."—Id., p. 736.

Touching the classification and rank of diplomatic representatives, the Department of State at Washington, in its official "Instructions to Diplomatic Officers of the United States" in 1897, announced the adoption by our Government of the rules formulated in 1815 by the Congress of Vienna, whereby papal legates and nuncios are classed with ambassadors in the highest grade of diplomats.—Moore's International Law Digest, vol. IV, p. 430; American and English Encyclopædia of Law, vol. XX, p. 794.

From the foregoing citations it appears that the pope holds himself out to the world as a sovereign and IS ACCEPTED AS A PRE-EMINENT AND PRIVILEGED SOVEREIGN AND TREATED AS SUCH BY THE GREAT POWERS, INCLUDING THE UNITED STATES; that he is expressly declared to be such by the law of Italy; and that his diplomatic

representatives are placed in the highest class with the ambassadors of other nations and are given precedence of all others in that class, so that the papal nuncio or legate is dean of the diplomatic corps at every capital in the world, including our own.

Before passing from the consideration of the pope's envoys, it is proper to remark that ambassadors and public ministers, and all other diplomatic officers, are exclusively the envoys of the sovereign nations by whom they are commissioned. Each delivers his credentials with impressive solemnity to the executive head of the nation to which he is accredited or to the legally authorized representative. *They are distinctly officers of state, not of religion. On September* 25, 1862, Secretary of State Seward, in official instructions to Mr. Blatchford, American envoy, used the following words touching the political agitation of which the pope was then the center:

"That duty is to forbear altogether from taking any part in the controversy. The reasons for this forbearance are three: First, that *so far as spiritual or ecclesiastical matters enter into the question they are beyond your province,* FOR YOU ARE A POLITICAL REPRESENTATIVE ONLY."—Moore's International Law Digest, vol. VI, pp. 21 and 22.

Volume XX of the "American and English Encyclopædia of Law," at page 20, gives the following definition from Bouvier's "Law Dictionary":

"An ambassador is a minister sent abroad by some foreign *State* or *prince,* with legal commission and authority to transact business *on behalf of his country* with the *government* to which he is sent."

6. *The Pope Makes Treaties.*—Still further proof of the sovereignty claimed by the pope and conceded to him by the other powers is afforded in the treaties which he makes. It is elementary that the making of treaties is strictly a function of sovereign power, and states not possessing the attributes of sovereignty cannot enter into valid conventions with other States. The Supreme Court of the United States has quite recently approved the following pertinent definition:

"Treaties are contracts between NATIONS."—Rainey vs. U. S., 232 U. S. 310.

The "American and English Encyclopædia of Law," vol. XXVIII, at page 476, says:

"*A treaty is a contract between two or more SOVEREIGNS.* . . . As a general rule, every *sovereign State* whose powers have not been limited or modified by compacts with other States has the power to make treaties."

For reasons best known to himself, the pope calls the conventions or agreements which he enters into with the other powers by the Latin name of *concordats* instead of treaties; but that does not affect their substance, since they have all the solemnity and characteristics of international treaties. For reasons that seem equally sinister and mysterious, he calls his diplomatic representatives legates or nuncios, but the Congresses of Vienna and Aix-la-Chapelle place them in the same grade with ambassadors of other sovereigns and accord to them the highest rank in the diplomatic service. Moore's "International Law Digest," vol. I, p. 39, again cites with approval Rivier's treatise in support of the following statement:

"The pope, though deprived of the territorial dominion which he formerly enjoyed, holds as *sovereign pontiff and head of the Roman Catholic Church* an exceptional position. Though, in default of territory, he is not a temporal sovereign, he is in many respects treated as such. He has the right of active and passive legation, and his envoys of the first class, *his apostolic nuncios, are specially privileged.* Nevertheless, he does not make war, and the conventions which he concludes with States are not called treaties, but concordats. His relations with the kingdom of Italy are governed, unilaterally, by the Italian law of May 13, 1871, called 'the law of guarantees,' against which Pius IX. and Leo XIII. have not ceased to protest."

It is true the pope is not now permitted to keep military forces and make war directly, but history is full of the intrigues and persecutions with which he has convulsed the world in its bloodiest wars. During the most gigantic and sanguinary of all wars, that war which began in 1914 and quickly involved nearly all Europe, the press has been permitted to make known significantly frequent and mysterious secret missions between the Vatican and the Roman Catholic Emperor of Austria-Hungary, who took the first hostile steps that actually precipitated the cataclysm.

(To be continued.)

IS THE ROMAN CHURCH IN POLITICS?

The following quotations will speak for themselves.

"We exhort all Catholics to devote careful attention to public matters, and take part in all municipal affairs and elections, and all public services, meetings and gatherings. All Catholics must make themselves felt as active elements in daily political life in countries where they live. *All Catholics should exert their power to cause the constitutions of States to be modeled on the principles of the true Church.*"—Pope Leo XIII. Encyclical Letter, Nov. 7, 1885, reported by cable to the "New York Herald."

"*Every* word Leo speaks from his high chair is the voice of the Holy Ghost, and *must* be obeyed. To every Catholic heart comes no thought but obedience. It is said that politics is not within the province of the Church, and that the Church has only jurisdiction in matters of faith. You say, 'I will receive my faith from the pontiff, but I will not receive my politics from him.' This assertion is disloyal and untruthful. . . . You must not think as you choose; you must think as Catholics. The man who says, 'I will take my faith from Peter, but I will not take my politics from Peter,' is not a true Catholic. The Church teaches that the supreme pontiff *must be obeyed*, because he is the vicar of the Lord. Christ speaks through him."—Vicar-General Preston. Sermon preached in New York, Jan. 1, 1888.

"In politics, which are inseparably bound up with the laws of morality and religious duties, men ought *always and in the first place to serve*, as *far as possible*, the *interests of Catholicism*. As soon as they are seen to be in danger, all differences should cease between Catholics. Since the fate of States depends principally on the disposition of those who are at the head of the government, the Church cannot grant its patronage or favor to men whom it knows to be hostile to it, who openly refuse to respect its rights; who seek to break the alliance established by the nature of things between religious interests and the interests of the civil order. On the contrary, its duty is to favor those who, *having sound ideas as to the relations between Church and State*, wish to make them both harmonize for the common good. These principles contain the rule according to which every Catholic *ought to model his public life.*"—Leo XIII.

CHANGES IN BOLIVIA—ONCE UNDER ROME'S SWAY

For nearly 400 years the only religion permitted by law in Bolivia was Roman Catholicism, and the penalty of death was provided for those who would attempt to propagate any other faith. "A Protestant was not allowed by the authorities, ecclesiastical or civil, to have family worship in his own home," says Rev. A. B. Reekie, the pioneer missionary of the Canadian Baptist Board.

"When we entered the country," he says, "the Constitution of Bolivia read: 'The State recognizes and maintains the Roman Catholic Apostolic Religion, and prohibits all other public worship, except in colonies, where there will be toleration.'"

The religious attitude of all Bolivians was antagonistic to evangelical work. This was sixteen years ago. To-day, after sixteen years, Bolivia is greatly changed. The revolution resulted in a change of government, a break with the past and a forward march was begun. Now there is full religious liberty, and marriage is a State ceremony. The cemeteries have been taken from the Church, and are under the control of the municipalities. The clergy, no matter what their crime, were formerly answerable only to the ecclesiastical courts, but are now answerable to civil courts. Religious instruction is no longer permitted in Government schools during school hours. The convents have been recently confiscated and others are threatened. The City Council of La Paz, the capital, has prohibited all religious processions on the streets, and the question of separation of Church and State will probably soon be an accomplished fact.

At least sixty per cent. of the men of Bolivia (exclusive of Indians) have drifted away from the Church of Rome, and the attitude of many of the women also toward Romanism and toward the Gospel has greatly changed. Few young men are preparing for the priesthood, and those few are from the lower classes. Already some rural parishes have been abandoned for lack of priests.

When the Minister of Education undertook to build up a national system of education he found himself handicapped

by lack of buildings, equipment, and suitable teachers, and by old and antiquated methods. The mission schools gave a practical demonstration of new methods and new ideas, and helped the Government to reconstruct the national system along modern lines.

RELICS IN THE PAPAL CATHEDRAL

Over the high altar, preserved in a magnificent reliquary of crystal, is the Sacred Table of the Last Supper, upon which Jesus Christ on the night before the crucifixion instituted the Adorable Mystery of the Eucharist. Under the high altar is kept the wooden altar upon which St. Peter used to offer up the Holy Sacrifice, and which can now be used only by the pope himself. With extreme difficulty this was saved from the fire that gutted the Basilica in 1308. Here, also, are the heads of St. Peter and St. Paul, which were taken from the apostles' tombs by Pope Sergius II. shortly before the Saracens invaded Rome. The golden busts in which they are kept are quite modern, for the French stole the silver busts covered with jewels in which they were preserved prior to the coming of those ruthless barbarians.

Popes and saints lie buried here, but there is only one other relic of which I shall speak, viz., the famous picture of our Lord, which has been taken to the Latern from the chapel of sanctum sanctorum, where it is jealously preserved by the Passionists. This is the picture called the "Acheivopita" or "Painted Not by Mortal Hand." It is painted on a panel of cedar wood, and tradition states it to have been outlined by St. Luke the Evangelist and completed by angels, hence its name. Without entering into its origin we must conclude that this is one of the most ancient of relics. "Whatever be its origin," says the author of the Holy Year of Jubilee, "there can be no question of its antiquity, and to the veneration in which it has been held since the eighth century. Amid the panic caused by the Lombard invasion, A. D. 754, Pope Stephen II. instituted a solemn procession to St. Mary Major, himself carrying this picture of our Lord, the people following him with ashes sprinkled on their heads and chanting." —The Catholic News.

ANOTHER INFAMOUS BILL

Protestant Children May Become Helpless Prey of Rome.

A bill is in process of enactment by Congress to enlarge the powers of the Juvenile Court of the District of Columbia. This measure is so written that, to a casual reader, it looks harmless and beneficent, but a careful study shows clearly the cloven hoof of papal intrigue deeply concealed in its most vital provisions.

This measure, if enacted into law, would clothe the judge of the Juvenile Court with power to place any child in the district, without notice to parent or guardian, and without process, complaint or judicial hearing, in Rome's private prisons that defy public inspection, and would authorize those private prisons to draw on the Treasury of the United States for the alleged maintenance of such child.

On March 6, 1914, Attorney General McReynolds appointed a committee composed of four persons, one of whom is professor of sociology in the Catholic University here, to draw up this bill. A few months after rendering this service, Mr. McReynolds was appointed a member of the Supreme Court of the United States.

The bill prepared by this committee of four was introduced in Congress January 8th by Representative Ben Johnson, of Kentucky, a Roman Catholic. On February 4th the House Committee on District of Columbia, of which Mr. Johnson is chairman, reported the bill favorably with a single insignificant amendment.

On March 13th it came up in the House of Representatives and was considered several hours and then continued for further consideration and passage later. The discussion in the House disclosed some of the diabolical features of the bill as well as the animus back of it with unmistakable clearness. Patriotic organizations in the District of Columbia are deeply aroused.

Section 10, of this bill, which is known as H. R. 8348, provides that any person, however truculent or irresponsible, may, without knowledge but on mere information and belief, file in the Juvenile Court a petition, charging any child, even though the petitioner does not know its name or address, with having improper or insufficient guardianship or control.

On the filing of such petition the judge is authorized to issue mandatory process requiring the child forthwith to appear in court to be dealt with according to the provisions of the bill or

act. The court is further authorized to dispense with services of any summons or notice to the parents or custodian of the child and to exclude the public and hear and determine the case in private.

It is further provided that, on such hearing, the court may commit the child to any institution, association or corporation within or without the District of Columbia.

There is the cloven hoof. This court could take any child in the district by summary and compulsory process and, without the knowledge of its parents, commit it to any institution in the world, and neither the child nor the parent would have any recourse nor any relief.

Section 30 provides for an appeal, but leaves the action of the Juvenile Court undisturbed by the appeal, and expressly authorizes the judge of said court to make any such supplement order pending the appeal, as will defeat the appeal and prevent a hearing in the Appellate Court.

A flood of light was thrown on the spirit and purpose of those responsible for this act during its consideration in the House of Representatives.

The following wholesome amendment was offered touching the commitment of children to private and sectarian institutions:

"Provided, however, that no such commitment shall be made to any institution, association or corporation, not subject to regular inspection by authority of law."

To this amendment Congressman Tynkham, of the city of Boston, with its vast Roman Catholic population, objected strongly because "THE EFFECT OF THE AMENDMENT WOULD BE TO FORBID THE PLACING OF A CHILD IN A CATHOLIC INSTITUTION."

His objection on that ground was sustained and the amendment was defeated.

There you have it. In view of the known conditions in the Roman Catholic prisons, and in view of the conditions dragged to light in the recent investigation of those dens in New York City, what will the American people say to those who are deliberately setting this diabolical trap for the children of half a million people? Write your Congressman what you think. Write today.

GILBERT O. NATIONS,
Vice-President Free Press Defense League.